



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## EDITORIAL.

WITH THIS NUMBER the BOTANICAL GAZETTE passes into the possession of the University of Chicago. The only change that will be apparent to readers will come from the much larger opportunity of serving botany, for the same editors will remain in charge, and the general purpose of the journal will continue to be the same. The establishment of a Department of Botany, and the appointment of the senior editor as head professor, justifies the University of Chicago in assuming financial responsibility for the publication of the GAZETTE, which has been brought to its present standing by private enterprise. That this has been possible demonstrates its adaptation to the needs of American botanists, as well as their cordial appreciation. Now that it is about to enter upon a period of strong financial support it expects to meet these needs in the fullest possible way, and more abundantly deserve the good-will of its readers.

It should be clearly understood that the GAZETTE is to be even more freely open to the botanists of the world than it has been in the past. It is not to be the organ of the botanical department of any university, but it belongs to all botanists everywhere. Its relation to the University of Chicago is simply to bring it that permanence and possibility of development which the present condition of botanical science demands.

\* \* \*

THE FIRST paper in the last number of the *Minnesota Botanical Studies* might furnish an excellent text for a homily upon the abuse of the footnote. On one page, containing less than 300 words, there are no less than twenty footnotes! When the author says of *Cypripedium*, "The genus is represented in Russia"<sup>44</sup>, Germany"<sup>45</sup> and other portions of Europe,"<sup>46</sup> she feels impelled to cite Ledebour and the *Bot. Jahresberichte* to establish these well-known facts. It would be almost as appropriate to cite the Century or Standard dictionaries as authority for the very words of the sentence. Such a volume of unnecessary references suggests too much the strutting turkey with feathers erected to produce an effect of size and weight beyond his real substance.

FOR THE LAST paper entitled "A study of some Minnesota Mycetozoa," Mr. Sheldon deserves severe censure. We have known Mr. Sheldon heretofore as a student of the very difficult genus *Astragalus*, in which his work has received sharp criticism, some undeserved and some doubtless deserved. His appearance as a reviser of genera in the far more obscure Mycetozoa is therefore a great surprise. It is quite impossible to believe that a student of as few years standing as the author of this paper can be entitled to speak upon both *Astragali* and *Mycetozoa*. Had Mr. Sheldon confined his publication to a list of Minnesota Mycetozoa, under names accepted by any monograph, he would have done a real service. But when in a list of forty-two species he proposes twenty-five new names (with long lists of synonyms in which we can have no confidence), he not only stultifies himself but does irreparable harm. The case, however, is even worse. Not content with dumping about the Minnesota species the rubbish of worthless names constructed from book synonymy, Mr. Sheldon proceeds to "indicate" the nomenclature of sixty-odd species with which he had no immediate concern. It is difficult to refrain from imputing unworthy motives in censuring such a flagrant abuse of liberty of publication.

While Mr. Sheldon is the chief sinner, we cannot but feel that the editor of the *Minnesota Botanical Studies* by permitting the publication of this paper, has, not only done harm to the science of taxonomy, but has put into the hands of conservatives in nomenclature a keen weapon which they will not hesitate to use against the advocates of reasonable reforms.